



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,645	11/21/2000	Steven J. Kruy	777.337US1	9553

7590

03/18/2003

STEVEN J ROCCI
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ MACKIEWCZ & NORRIS LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE-46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

AL HASHEMI, SANA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/717,645

Applicant(s)

KRUY ET AL.

Examiner

Sana Al-Hashemi

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1- 7, and 9-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1- 7, 9-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed on February 11, 2003 in which Claims 1-24 are presented for examination

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1- 7, 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) as being anticipated by Eisenberg et al. (US Patent No. 5,890,166)

1. Regarding Claims 1, and 9, Eisenberg discloses a computerized method for maintaining versions of project data, the project data, having at least one project data attribute, the method comprising (see column 29, lines 23-26, Eisenberg):

receiving an updated value for the project data attribute (see column 5, lines 12-15, Eisenberg);

saving a previous version of the project data, wherein the previous version contains a value of the at least one project data attribute prior to the update (see column 5, lines 23-27, Eisenberg);

creating a current version of the project data, wherein the current version of the project data contains the updated value (see column 5, lines 28-35, Eisenberg).

Art Unit: 2171

2. Regarding Claims 2, and 10, Eisenberg discloses a computerized method wherein saving a previous version of the project data includes setting an end time field in a first data structure to a value a current time (see column 5, lines 39-41, Eisenberg);

wherein creating a current version of the project data includes the tasks of:

creating a second data structure (see column 15, lines 17-20, Eisenberg);

setting a start time field in the second data structure to a value comprising the current time used to set the end time field of the first data structure (see column 15, lines 27-29, Eisenberg);

setting an end time field in the second data structure to a value representing a most recent version of the object (see column 15, lines 17-20, Eisenberg).

3. Regarding Claims 3, and 11, Eisenberg discloses a computerized method further comprising setting a property value field to the updated value (see column 19, lines 46-49, Eisenberg).

4. Regarding Claims 4, 5, 12, and 13, Eisenberg discloses a computerized method wherein the value representing the most recent value is a blank or null value (see column 19, lines 42-45, Eisenberg).

5. Regarding Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, and 18, Eisenberg discloses a computerized method wherein the data structure comprises at least one row in a database and the database is a relational database (see column 13, lines 37-46, Eisenberg)

6. Regarding Claim 8, Eisenberg discloses a computer-readable medium having a data structure stored thereon, the medium comprising:

Art Unit: 2171

a first field comprising an identifier for a project data issue (see column 15, lines 1-2, Eisenberg);

a second field comprising a start time (see column 15, lines 17-20, Eisenberg);

a third field comprising an end time (see column 19, lines 16-18, Eisenberg);

a fourth field comprising a project data property value for the project data issue (see column 19, lines 42-50, Eisenberg); and

wherein the second and third field define a range of time that the project data property value for the project data issue identified by the first field has the project data property value in the fourth field (see column 19, lines 8-15, Eisenberg).

7. Regarding Claim 16, Eisenberg discloses a computerized system comprising:

a processor and a computer-readable medium;

an operating environment executing on the processor from the computer-readable medium; and

a project tracking system operative to maintain versions of data associated with a project, the data associated with a project including a project data element (see column 18, lines 10-20, Eisenberg).

8. Regarding Claim 17, Eisenberg discloses a computerized system wherein the project tracking system comprises:

a visual interface operative to display the data associated with the project and receive an update to the project data element (see column 13, lines 9-17, Eisenberg);

a project database operative to store a new version of data associated with a project upon receipt of an update to the project data element (see column 18, lines 35-38, Eisenberg).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenberg et al. (US Patent No. 5,890,166) and further in view of Bereiter et al (US Patent No. 5,917,492) .

9. Regarding Claim 19, Eisenberg discloses a method for displaying a property value for a version of project data, the method comprising:

determining a selected version of the project data (see column 21, lines 7-11, Eisenberg);

reading a selected property value for the selected version (see column 21, lines 12-13, Eisenberg);

reading a second property value for at least one other version of project data (see column 21, lines 13-15, Eisenberg);

comparing the selected property value to the second property value (see column 21, lines 15-25, Eisenberg);

Eisenberg does not explicitly disclose if the selected property value and the second property value are different, then highlighting the selected property value. However, Bereiter et al. discloses the method of highlighting the selected property value. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify/add the highlighting the selected property value to the

Art Unit: 2171

Eisenberg invention with the motivation of making it attract the user attention to the most recent updates.

10. Regarding Claims 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, Bereiter discloses the method wherein highlighting the selected property value includes providing a predetermined background color for the selected property value, providing a predetermined background color for the selected property value, displaying a glyph beside the selected property (see column 8, lines 34-67, Bereiter). Bereiter does not disclose the displaying of the selected property value in a strike-through font, displaying a squiggle under the selected property, blinking the selected property value. However. It would have been obvious to add the strike-through font, displaying a squiggle under the selected property, blinking to the selected property value with the motivation they are well known, comment, and efficient way to draw the attention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner's response

11. Applicant's arguments filed February 11, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's primary argument (s).

Applicant argues Eisenberg does not teach the step "saving a previous version of the project data, wherein the pervious version contains a value of the at least one project data attribute prior to the update". Examiner disagrees. Eisenberg does teach the step of saving previous version in historical records refer to column 5, lines 43-45.

Applicant argues that Eisenberg does not teach the step of maintaining versions. Examiner disagrees. Eisenberg does teach the step of maintaining versions refer to column 19, lines 63-67, column 20, lines 1-14, Eisenberg discloses the steps of maintaining the versions.

Applicant argues "reading a selected property value for the selected version" is not disclosed in Eisenberg. Examiner disagrees. Referring to column 21, lines 26-29, Eisenberg does discloses the property value for the version if update by an administrative user.

Applicant argues that Eisenberg does not disclose the step of "comparing the selected property value to the second property value". Examiner disagrees. Eisenberg does not explicitly shows the step of compression. However referring to column 6, lines 26-30. Eisenberg does the step of comparing the value in order to create new versions.

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2171

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4881. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436. Any response to this office action should be mailed to: The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. Or telefax at phone number (703) 746-7416. For formal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT". Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, 6th Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia. 22202.

Application/Control Number: 09/717,645

Page 9

Art Unit: 2171

Sana Al-Hashemi
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
March 11, 2003



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100